

ome meant for very beginners, others for advanced students. There is no evidence that the editors know what are the needs of young boys, or how to meet them intelligently.'

When, however, I turn to Mr. Ure's book I am still more staggered by your criticism that it is a school book of 'the old type.' It is, on the whole, the most revolutionary book on Elementary Greek that I know. It is an experiment of 'the new teaching,' moving on parallel lines with your own 'First Greek Course,' Mr. Chambers's 'Greek War of Independence,' and Professor Walters's and my own 'Forilegium Tironis Graecum.' It is from first page to last meant for beginners, definitely, and—some old-fashioned people might think—even comically, meant for beginners. On p. 55 I find 'The article often preserves before μέν and δέ its original use as a pronoun (cp. Eng. the=this, Fr. le=ille). You must always decide from the context whether the article before μέν and δέ is used as a pronoun, as in this passage, or merely as the article, agreeing with some substantive that follows.' On p. 60 again I read that 'There are two negatives in Greek οὐ and μή'; and I do not think there is a single remark in the book out of harmony with these true, but scarcely 'advanced' statements! The principles, too, on which Mr. Ure has acted are fully explained in his Preface.

You will perhaps answer me, Mr. Editor, that Thucydides is not meant for 'young boys.' But why should you assume that all beginners are young boys? The book was written for the Matriculation Examination of the Northern Universities. Why should we only publish editions that assume that Greek is begun at the age of eleven, or even at that of fourteen? The whole tendency of the more advanced opinion on the teaching of Greek is that, even under favourable conditions, it had better be begun some years later than it is at present. You are yourself, of course, one of the chief exponents of this view. Even those, however, who are not convinced that this is the ideal to aim at, must allow that in a large number of boys schools, and in the majority of girls

schools, arrangements are not in fact made for teaching Greek till towards the end of the school course. There are plenty of people, too, who want to learn Greek, and yet have no opportunity of being taught it at school at all, but have to teach it themselves with a little private help, so as to fit themselves for the younger Universities. I have had several hundreds of students in my Greek classes since I have been at Cardiff—and the figures are not an exaggeration—who never began the Alphabet till they were 18, 19, or 20. A few of them have become very good scholars indeed, but—what is far more important—the great mass of them have taken a working knowledge of Greek and a love of Greek to many scattered pulpits, and many small secondary schools. This has probably happened on a bigger scale in Wales than elsewhere, because the Welsh temperament loves Greek poetry; but it is happening more or less all over the country. In the past, knowledge of Latin and Greek was a Class Distinction, and a Sex Distinction also. We hear from the great public schools that this is passing away, and that 'modern sides' are increasing at a rapid rate. If this tendency were not counterbalanced in another direction there might be cause for alarm. What is really happening, however, is that the old Class and Sex Distinction is being replaced by a new and more natural line of Cleavage. Our aim now must be to enlist on the side of Greek all those who love poetry and value the spiritual side of things, all who want to know what is said in the greatest of the world's literatures. And we want books for them, not baby books, nor dull books, but the best things in Greek adapted for grown-up beginners. We want Homer, and Plato, and Thucydides, and Aristophanes; and so long as the subject matter is great, and we are introduced to it by a good scholar, we shall listen to him with gratitude when he tells us that 'There are two negatives in Greek, οὐ and μή.'

I am, dear Mr. Editor,

RONALD BURROWS.

University College, Cardiff.

LATIN READING IN SCHOOLS.

SIR,

Might I, as one imperitiæ obscuritate inuolutus, ask for enlightenment on some words of Prof. E. V. Arnold in his article on Latin and Politics (above, p. 67)? 'Already in more quarters than one the idea is gaining ground that the best Latin authors only . . . must be selected . . . so as to form a complete scheme of reading within the ordinary school course.'

I had thought that this was an idea against which the Classical Association would warn those who desire a 'quickenning of the spirit and renewing of the methods of classical teaching,' exhorting them to an extension of the curriculum.

May I quote Lord Halsbury's words at the Second general meeting of the Classical Association January 1905 (*Proc.* p. 35)? 'I do not mean to say that

the jealous treatment of Greek literature in the sense that none but the best models shall be presented to the pupil's mind has not been too rigidly insisted on, and that there might well be a more diffused and more free intercourse with Greek writers, even if not the best specimens of Attic Greek. Few books are more amusing to a boy than Herodotus I have referred to Greek but it is only because the cry against Greek has been the loudest and most insistent. The narrowness of the Latin curriculum is still what one learns from those who have ceased to take any interest in Latin literature. Horace and Virgil—Virgil and Horace. How many have read or heard of the *Quaestiones Naturales* of Seneca? And how many but for the exertions of Mr. Rowe and Mr. Justice Ridley would have read Lucan's *Pharsalia*?'

G. A. PURTON.